

Chair that the matter had been seized by a court of law and also Government had ordered an independent enquiry. That is also postponed now in deference to the fact that the matter is seized by a competent court of law. In view of these things, this House will not be able to accept or admit this motion for discussion and leave should be refused. I submit to the Chair that it would not be proper to admit this adjournment motion for discussion.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister was saying that leave of the House should be refused. That is in the second stage of the question. The first stage is whether the Speaker admits it or not. It is only after the motion is admitted, the question of giving leave comes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is what he said; he said that it should not be admitted; I do not see any difficulty in this.

Sri Arumugham wanted to say something.

***Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM** (Kolar Gold Fields).—I am very happy that the Speaker has taken about 45 minutes of this House over this matter (Laughter). But, what was needed was the statement of the Home Minister. The whole of the Opposition members were with the Chair. We wanted to know as to what happened as regards this affair. We have heard it from the Home Minister. I thank the Chair very much for giving us the opportunity of hearing the Home Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After hearing both the sides, I am not in a position to allow this motion; I do not give the consent.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Sir, with deep regret I make the following statement with reference to a very unfortunate incident that happened at Mysore.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—I rise to a point of order this connection. In dealing with Adjournment Motions the provision is that not more than one such motion should be made at the same sitting. We had enough and more discussion on one subject. We cannot take up the other.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—My Hon'ble friend seems to make a good deal of confusion with regard to the rule in spite of the fact that he has it in his own hands. In fact, no motion is discussed. This is the first one. The previous one was disallowed.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The rule applies when there is a motion; there is no motion at all. I am just trying to understand whether I should give my consent to the motion to be brought in the House.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Sir, on the 15th of August, during the Independence Day Celebrations in Mysore, programmes were drawn up for the observance of the Independence Day Celebration on a grand scale. The morning functions went off very happily.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—I rise to a point of order. The Hon'ble Home Minister seems to make a statement on the incident that took place in Mysore City on the 15th August. I believe it is within the knowledge of the Minister and if it is not, I would like to bring it to his notice that the matter is before a court and the matter has already been subjected to judicial scrutiny. Therefore, even on this motion the Minister cannot make a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is it *sub judice*?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—Yes.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—I want to differ from my Hon'ble friend. It is not *sub judice*.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY (Malleswaram).—Sir, I wish the Hon'ble Member produces some evidence to show that

Explosion of Chandramandala in Mysore.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now, the other Adjournment Motion about the incident at Mysore.

Sri C. M. POONACHA (Minister for Home Affairs and Industries).—I thought that the Chair would not allow the Adjournment Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will decide after I hear you.

(Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY)
the matter is *sub judice*. Oral references will not be enough. There is a 'point of order fever' in this House and all of us are confused. (Laughter.)

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—From the information that I have, a case has already been registered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Government say that they have no such information. Anyhow, I will request the Home Minister, as far as possible, to make a few remarks.

*Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—On a point of order. Is this the way in which we have to behave in this august House? I request the Chair to allow me to say a few words on this. ತಿಂಗಳೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ 150 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ದಿನವೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ 16 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಜ್ಞಾನದ ದೇಶದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಯಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ; ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ನಿಜ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಏನು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದು, ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗುವ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕೇನುಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರಾ? ಕೇನುಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ರಿಕಾರ್ಡುಗಳಿದ್ದು ಬರವಣಿಗೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ನಾನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇನುಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇನುಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? This is not a point to argue and say that it is *sub judice*.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has already been settled and the remarks made by Sri Suryanarayana Rao to the effect that the matter was *sub judice* have not been accepted by the Home Minister. He has already denied that there was any matter in the court.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Ramanagaram).—Sir, you have given the ruling that the Speaker was the final authority to determine whether a particular matter is *sub judice* or not. You cannot, therefore, transfer that authority to the Home Minister. You were just pleased to say that the Home Minister had contradicted Sri Suryanarayana Rao and therefore the Home Minister could be allowed to make the statement. Sri Suryanarayana Rao is as much an Hon'ble Member as Sri Poonacha, who, besides happens to be the Home Minister for the time being.

So far as their statements are concerned, they are to be equally respected. But, many a time it so happens that whether a member is a Minister or not, he may not be in possession of all the facts regarding a particular case. Since there has been an assertion on the part of a member, namely, Sri Suryanarayana Rao, that this matter has gone before a court of law, you may be pleased to give him an opportunity to show that this is *sub judice* if the Home Minister does not agree that it is so. Therefore this matter may be adjourned for a day or so and if Sri Suryanarayana Rao is able to prove that this matter is *sub judice*, then you have to decide whether this matter should be allowed to be discussed or not. Suppose, in the absence of such a proof or disproof we discussed it and ultimately we found that the matter was before a court of law; then, we would have committed a breach of the rule. So, we have to give an opportunity to Sri Suryanarayana Rao to show that it is *sub judice*.

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—I want a clarification, Sir. The Hon'ble Member just now said that Sri Poonacha was the Home Minister for the time being. I want to know the implication of the word time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are also here for the time being; we are here for five years; that means we are here for the time being.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—Remarks were made that Sri Poonacha was the Home Minister for the time being. As a Minister if he is to be here for the time being, how can the Hon'ble Member Sri Hanumant haiya make a distinction between Sri Poonacha as a Minister for the time being and as a member for ever? I would like to know how he can make a distinction between a member who happens to be here for a long period and a member who is a Minister for the time being?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—By way of personal explanation, I may say that you have already answered the point. Why I said that was, here is a case where two Hon'ble Members of this House differ. It does not matter whether a particular member is a

Minister or not a Minister. I was comparing the rights of the members irrespective of the office they occupied.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are going too far. After all, when the Hon'ble Member Sri Hanumanthaiya says that Sri Poonacha is Home Minister for the time being, different meanings are possible; but, I will put the lenient meaning. 'For the time being' means, for the whole period of five years. (*Laughter.*)

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It cannot be a matter of ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a matter of opinion.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—That cannot be a matter even of opinion so far as the Speaker is concerned.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channapatna).—How can it be said that he will be here as Home Minister for five years?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, Hon'ble Member Sri Puttaramiya has a right to remove him from the post of Home Minister; I agree. He can do it if he likes.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—He can only try but he cannot do it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What I said is that Sri Puttaramiya can remove him; that is a different matter. When we want to give interpretation to a certain word, we must be lenient and guarded.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—We cannot agree, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is obvious. After all, the point is whether the matter is *sub judice* or not. One Hon'ble Member says that it is *sub judice* and another Hon'ble Member says that it is not. I have to wait and find out whether the matter is actually *sub judice*. When the Minister says that it is not *sub judice*, I must take that it is not *sub judice*.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—Supposing, there is a private case in a court of law? Will it not be necessary to take this into account and disallow discussion on this?

Dr. T. PARTHASARATHY.—on a point of order Sir, Mr. Speaker, I have observed that old Members of this House often stand up when you stand up. For the younger members, it is a bad

precedent. They should know that discipline of the House should be maintained at any cost.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as that question is concerned, the younger people must race with the older people; they are stronger. (*Laughter.*) But, let us not enter into any race in these matters.

So far as the question raised by Sri Bheemappa Naik is concerned, there is no use pursuing these matters like this. I make a last appeal. Let him not disturb the proceedings in this way.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I was only submitting this. *Sub judice* means, an enquiry before a court of law. It may be a cognisable case or a non-cognisable case, in which case the Government may not be in the know of the matter. It may be *sub judice* and yet the Government may not have the information about the matter. Supposing a private case has been registered; then, it is certainly *sub judice*. Therefore, as Sri Hanumanthaiya submitted, this may be taken up on another day so that whether this matter is *sub judice* or not may be cleared. If still the Speaker allows, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Such minute distinctions should not be made. After all, it is a broad question as to whether matters are in *sub judice* or not. When the Minister says that it is not *sub judice*, I accept it. There should be an end of the matter.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—If the Hon'ble Minister only feels that no case is going to be registered.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—If a matter goes to a court of law tomorrow, that cannot be *sub judice* to-day. So far as the point of *sub judice* is concerned, I have not been convinced that the matter is in a court of law. So, I allow the Hon'ble Minister to make a few remarks, but as carefully as if the matter is in the court of law.

3 P.M.

Sri C. M. POONACHA.—Sir, since my Hon'ble friend Sri Suryanarayana Rao has brought it to the notice of this House that a case has been registered, I seek the permission of the Chair

(SRI C. M. POONACHA)

to take up this question tomorrow so that I may be able to check up and find out the latest position and so that nothing that is done in this House should offend any court that is seized of the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for recess and resume discussion when it re-commences.

The House adjourned for Lunch at Four Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty-eight Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

CITY OF BANGALORE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

Introduction.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—I beg to introduce The City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1957.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced.

MYSORE LEGISLATURE SALARIES (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—I beg to move:

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Second Amendment) Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Second Amendment) Bill, 1957, be taken into consideration.”

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I will make some brief remarks. It is considered necessary to provide free furnished accommodation to mofussil members of the Legislature and to pay a sum of rupees sixteen as daily allowance to both local and mofussil members. Formerly, the allowances were different, namely Rs. 12-8-0 and Rs. 16 for local and mofussil members respectively. Now it is proposed to introduce a uniform rate of allowances and also provide free furnished accommodation during session time and half the rent during off-sessions.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಒಂದೂವರೆ ಘಂಟೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವವರು ಏಳು ನಿಮಿಷ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಾಸ್ತಿ ಹೊತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಂತಹುದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯುಕ್ತವಾದಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬಂ ಅದರೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೊತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ರೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಕಾಲರ್‌ಶಿಪ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಹಣ ಕಾನಿನ್ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುವಾಗ ಅದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಎದ್ದುಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ನಾನೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ನಾನೇ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರಲೇ ಎಂದು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡುವಷ್ಟು ಧೈರ್ಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಏನು ಅನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ ಜನ! ಈ ತರಹ ಹಣವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಯ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೇ! ನಾವು ಜನಗಳಿಂದ ಚನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ಇದೆ. ಜನ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. 5,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ದೇಶದ ಜನರು ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ನೀವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ, ದೇಶದ ಜನವನ್ನು, ಯಾರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ, ನೀವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಮಂಡಲ ರಚಿಸಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ, ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಘನತೆ, ಗೌರವ ಪಡೆಯುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ ಅಂಥ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ಶೋಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮನುಷ್ಯರು 2ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ “such members shall be provided with fully furnished accommodation, without payment of rent.” ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೂಡ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. Free furnished quarters ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ನಾವೇಕೆ ಇಂಥ free quartersನಲ್ಲರ ಬೇಕು. ನಾಕಷ್ಟು ಮನೆಗಳಲ್ಲದೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ಸಮಾರಂಭ ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಿಡ್ಲಿ ಹೌಸ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಮಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು! ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು representation type, ಸರಿಯಾದ ಆಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ,